a client station adapted for communication with an associated client station transceiver; and

a server configured to periodically receive or generate information to be delivered to the client station, the server linked to an associated server transceiver, wherein

the server is further configured to transmit a message to the client station via the respective server and client station transceivers upon receiving or generating a selected type and quantity [threshold] of information to be delivered to the client station.

Please add the following new claims 24 and 25:

24.   (New) The method of claim 1, the message further indicating the type or quantity, or both, of the information to be delivered to the client station.

25.   (New) The method of claim 24, comprising the further steps of:

evaluating a received message at the client station to determine whether the information is of a selected type or quantity, or both; and

establishing a connection between the client station and server in response to a received message if the information is of a selected type or quantity, or both.

REMARKS:

With this amendment, claims 1-8, 10-12, and 14-25 remain pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to include a proper antecedent to "client station" in line 5. Claim 3 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-7, 10-12, 14-20, and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Hidary. Claims 8 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hidary. New dependent claims 24 and 25 have been added to more fully set forth the invention of claim 1. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks:

§ 102(e) Rejections over Hidary

Claim 1 recites "[a] method for transmitting information from a server to a client station in a mobile-based client-server system," including "determining that the server has information to be transmitted to the client station." This claimed method alleviates requiring a mobile client station to sustain a wireless communication link with the server, until the data is ready to be retrieved. Applicants respectfully submit that Hidary does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, the step of "determining that the server has information to be transmitted to the client station," as is required to sustain a rejection under § 102(e).

Hidary describes an ad server that stores various commercial messages. Although Hidary does teach having the ad server send a "request-to-send" message to a client (fig. 1, col. 2/lines 63-67, and col. 3/lines 1-3), the request-to-send message is sent based on *whether the client is ready to receive* the commercial messages from the server, not whether the server has the commercial messages ready to send to the client (see col. 2/lines 63-64). Indeed, because the commercial messages are already stored in the ad server of Hidary, there is no motivation to modify Hidary to solve the problem addressed by the present invention; namely, how to efficiently transmit information from a server that does *not* necessarily have the information on hand.

As claims 2-8 and 24-25 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that they are also patentable over Hidary, for at least these same reasons.

Independent claim 10, as amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 9, recites a method including "evaluating information at the server to determine whether the information is of a selected *type and quantity*[,]" before it is sent to the client station. Making this evaluation before setting up a relatively expensive mobile transmission link avoids the expense of sustaining wireless communications between a server and a mobile client station until both the type and quantity of the pending information are sufficient to justify the cost. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that Hidary does not teach this claimed method.

Notably, Hidary is not concerned with eliminating the unnecessary sustaining of a mobile link between server and client because the server did not having the type and/or quantity of information necessary to justify the cost of the transmission link. Nor does Hidary teach or suggest any method of solving this problem. Hidary is only concerned with whether the *client is*

ready to receive messages from the ad server. There is no regard paid in Hidary to quality or quantity of information to be sent, or whether it might be better to hold off on establishing and sustaining a mobile transmission link until the server has a sufficient type and quantity of information to justify the cost of the link.

For at least the reasons cited above with regard to independent claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 11-12 are also patentable over Hidary.

Independent claim 16 recites a machine readable medium having stored thereon a program for causing a client station to perform steps including "evaluating a received message to determine whether the server has a selected type and quantity of information waiting for [transmission to] the client station." For the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10, Hidary does not teach, explicitly or inherently, a stored program that performs this evaluation. As such, the rejection over Hidary of claim 16, along with dependent claims 17-18, cannot be sustained.

Independent claim 19, as amended, recites a mobile-based client-server system, including a server configured to periodically transmit messages to a client station "upon receiving or generating a selected *type and quantity* of information to be delivered to the [respective] client station." For the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10, Hidary does not teach, explicitly or inherently, such a system. As such, the Applicants believe that claim 19, as amended, along with dependent claims 20-23, are patentable over Hidary.

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Hidary does not teach, explicitly or inherently, the subject matter of claims 1-8, 10-12, 16-25.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

LYON & LYON LLP

Dated: _Aug 10, 1999_

By: _David T Burse_

David T. Burse
Reg. No. 37,104

633 West Fifth Street, Suite 4700
Los Angeles, California 90071-2066
(408) 993-1555

6